

**REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the reasons that follow.

**Status of Claims:**

No claims are currently being added, amended or canceled.

A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

Claims 1-3, 5-7 and 9-13 remain pending in this application.

**Claim Rejections – Prior Art:**

In numbered paragraph 26) of the Office Action, the Examiner relies on various portions of Fujita for allegedly teaching the use of directionality for his signal transmission and signal receiving systems. However, those portions of Fujita are not relevant to the claimed invention. The Office Action asserts that Fujita discloses an embodiment in which “The transmitter/receiver tower 3 has a transmitter antenna 8 and a receiver antenna 9 mounted at the top of the tower 3, which are connected to the main karaoke apparatus 6”, and “A signal receiving section 7 is provided above the transmitter/receiver tower 3 for receiving a signal emitted from the command device 12 that is operated by the user in the passenger car 40”. However, there is nothing in these or other portions of Fujita that teaches or suggests the use of directionality in his transmitting antenna and in his receiving antenna. Based on the disclosure of Fujita, one skilled in the art would understand that Fujita’s system uses omnidirectional antennas, which are not directional antennas.

Numbered paragraph 26) of the Office Action goes on to assert that “Fujita further disclosed ‘The transmitter 33 frequency-modulates the mixed signal with a high frequency radio wave at an FM radio frequency and sends the frequency-modulated (FM) signal to the transmitter antenna 8 from which the FM signal is transmitted.’” Again, this has nothing at all to do with the use of directionality in a transmitting antenna and in a receiving antenna. For example, an FM radio station uses omnidirectional antennas, and the fact that information output by those omnidirectional antennas is FM-modulated, is not at all relevant to the use of

directionality or for that matter to antennas for sending those FM-modulated signals over-the-air.

Numbered paragraph 26) of the Office Action further asserts that “Fujita also disclosed when ‘INTERNET’ is selected from the menu, an Internet browser is activated and displayed on the display screen 4 so that users in the car 40 can use the Internet from within the car 40. The Internet browser displayed on the display screen 4 is controlled by the wireless controller/command device 112.” Again, this has nothing at all to do with the use of directionality in a transmitting antenna and in a receiving antenna. The fact that Fujita’s wireless controller/command device 112 can control information to be displayed on a display screen 4 says nothing about the manner in which that information is sent, via antennas, from one location to another location. In Fujita, one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the wireless controller/command device 112 utilizes an omnidirectional antenna to send over-the-air signals to a display screen 4 within a car.

Accordingly, independent claim 1, which recites a plurality of communications devices each of which includes a direction antenna directed to a car, is patentable over the cited art of record.

With respect to independent claim 7, the Office Action asserts that the use of identification numbers is a form of biometrics data, and relies on a definition in the Microsoft Computer Dictionary for such an assertion. Applicant disagrees with this assertion. First, the common definition of biometrics data is something that relates directly to a biological aspect of a person, whereby an identification number is not such a thing. Second, the supposed definition relied on in the Office Action was not included with the Office Action, whereby such a definition may well have been something developed after the invention date of this application.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 7, which recites an Internet connection request step in which that request includes an identification number that has been uniquely assigned to a user of a user terminal, is patentable over the cited art of record.

All of the remaining pending dependent claims under rejection depend either directly or indirectly from either claim 1 or claim 7, and thus are patentable due to the features recited in claims 1 and 7, as well as for the specific features recited in those dependent claims.

**Conclusion:**

Since all of the issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed in this Amendment and Reply, Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date May 27, 2005

By Phillip J. Articola

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 22428  
Telephone: (202) 672-5407  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

David A. Blumenthal  
Registration No. 26,257

Phillip J. Articola  
Registration No. 38,819